

Bay District Schools

# Deane Bozeman School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Deane Bozeman School

13410 HIGHWAY 77, Panama City, FL 32409

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Ivan Beach**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/6/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Deane Bozeman School

13410 HIGHWAY 77, Panama City, FL 32409

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	65%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	9%

## School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	B	C

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

As collaborative stakeholders, our mission is to produce life-long independent learners. All students will be engaged in rigorous instruction through a disciplined and supportive environment that prepares them for college and career success in a global society.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Deane Bozeman School will equip students with the character and skills necessary to become productive and responsible community members.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Balkom, Joshua	Principal	
Beach, Ivan	Assistant Principal	
West, Christie	Assistant Principal	
Timmins, Kim	Assistant Principal	
Rudd, Pam	School Counselor	
Cook, Rachel	Instructional Technology	
Wade, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	

### Early Warning Systems

#### Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	54	64	70	65	63	62	154	131	150	147	139	115	113	1327	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	8	6	2	5	1	2	31	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	6	34	33	35	33	29	28	22	226	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	2	3	1	0	19

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	10	3	2	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	13	5	4	4	33

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

94

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 9/6/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	22	14	12	21	13	13	31	22	30	24	26	26	33	287
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	0	1	22	14	13	13	6	4	7	83
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	12	6	16	47
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	10	11	38	21	20	36	31	24	15	209

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	1	3	3	1	21	14	16	19	18	15	18	131

**Prior Year - Updated**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	21	16	6	12	15	25	19	36	46	23	24	27	282
One or more suspensions	2	3	4	0	3	3	18	28	51	49	31	16	26	234
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	12	31	15	24	89
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	6	34	33	33	33	29	28	22	224

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**



Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	2	0	2	3	21	15	35	39	27	24	26	199	

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	63%	73%	61%	49%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	64%	59%	50%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	58%	54%	47%	56%	51%
Math Achievement	65%	70%	62%	60%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%	57%	59%	57%	59%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	56%	52%	53%	58%	50%
Science Achievement	61%	65%	56%	50%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	84%	86%	78%	83%	79%	75%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	54 (0)	64 (0)	70 (0)	65 (0)	63 (0)	62 (0)	154 (0)	131 (0)	150 (0)	147 (0)	139 (0)	115 (0)	113 (0)	1327 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (22)	0 (14)	0 (12)	0 (21)	0 (13)	0 (13)	0 (31)	0 (22)	0 (30)	1 (24)	0 (26)	0 (26)	0 (33)	1 (287)
One or more suspensions	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	5 (22)	8 (14)	6 (13)	2 (13)	5 (6)	1 (4)	2 (7)	31 (83)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (5)	0 (12)	0 (6)	0 (16)	0 (47)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (3)	6 (10)	6 (11)	34 (38)	33 (21)	35 (20)	33 (36)	29 (31)	28 (24)	22 (15)	226 (209)

### Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	61%	18%	58%	21%
	2018	81%	57%	24%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	58%	13%	58%	13%
	2018	70%	51%	19%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	82%	56%	26%	56%	26%
	2018	55%	50%	5%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
06	2019	59%	56%	3%	54%	5%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
07	2019	57%	54%	3%	52%	5%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	51%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	68%	59%	9%	56%	12%
	2018	68%	58%	10%	58%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
09	2019	57%	58%	-1%	55%	2%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
10	2019	53%	53%	0%	53%	0%
	2018	46%	52%	-6%	53%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	84%	62%	22%	62%	22%
	2018	89%	63%	26%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	59%	17%	64%	12%
	2018	82%	59%	23%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	75%	54%	21%	60%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	65%	57%	8%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
06	2019	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
	2018	62%	52%	10%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
07	2019	66%	59%	7%	54%	12%
	2018	74%	59%	15%	54%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	42%	48%	-6%	46%	-4%
	2018	71%	48%	23%	45%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	53%	16%
	2018	69%	54%	15%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	57%	51%	6%	48%	9%
	2018	56%	49%	7%	50%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	71%	-5%	67%	-1%
2018	63%	64%	-1%	65%	-2%
Compare		3%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	74%	11%	71%	14%
2018	95%	76%	19%	71%	24%
Compare		-10%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	74%	9%	70%	13%
2018	79%	73%	6%	68%	11%
Compare		4%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	64%	3%	61%	6%
2018	63%	64%	-1%	62%	1%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	62%	3%	57%	8%
2018	65%	62%	3%	56%	9%
Compare		0%			

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	39	46	41	38	44	37	38	67		89	35
HSP	56	55		64	39			93			
MUL	55	60		57	45			82			
WHT	63	59	52	65	57	47	62	83	64	89	71
FRL	56	56	52	59	54	47	54	82	47	88	64
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	32	44	43	49	51	40	38	77		100	14
HSP	58	68		82	67		62				
MUL	35	52		50	31		70				
WHT	58	56	51	70	64	57	62	86	57	80	59
FRL	51	55	47	65	61	54	58	86	49	72	52
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	25	41	43	33	59	58	21	63		81	15
HSP	55	33		60	53						
MUL	50	53		69	82						
WHT	48	50	48	60	58	54	49	83	58	85	48
FRL	45	50	50	56	57	50	43	78	51	81	40

## ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	705
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Our Math lowest 25% performed the lowest as a whole. Interruption in instruction due to Hurricane Michael may have been a contributing factor.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

Our Math lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The 18-19 school year was a transitional year with a 6 week break in instruction along with an influx of students that could have contributed to the decline in student performance.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Our Math lowest 25% had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The 18-19 school year was a transitional year with a 6 week break in instruction along with an influx of students that could have contributed to the decline in student performance.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

ELA achievement showed the most improvement. We implemented after school tutoring focusing on ELA strategies for Elementary and Middle School students.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Attendance below 90% is an area of concern for all three levels.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.**

1. Learning gains for the lowest 25% in Math
2. Learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA
3. Graduation and acceleration points in high school
4. Learning gains in ELA and Math
5. Social and Emotional Behaviors

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Learning Gains for lowest 25% in ELA and Math
<b>Rationale</b>	Based on 18-19 assessment data, we identified the learning gains for the lowest 25 % as areas of concern in math and ela.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Students in the lowest 25% within each grade level will increase their learning gains by 5% in ELA and Math.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Christie West (westcl@bay.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Professional Learning Communities is an evidence- based strategy that is fully implemented at all levels at Bozeman.  Marzano describes the PLC concept as "one of the most powerful initiatives for school improvement I have seen in the last decade." Marzano, R. (2003). What works in schools: Translating research into action. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	John Hattie concluded that the best way to improve schools was to organize teachers into collaborative teams that clarify what each student must learn and the indicators of learning the team will track, to gather evidence of that learning on an ongoing basis, and to analyze the results together so that they could learn which instructional strategies were working and which were not. Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to student achievement. New York: Routledge.
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. -All PLCs will conduct deliberate and focused meetings in order to increase student achievement in all academic areas.</li> <li>2. -PLC teams will identify lowest 25% and will determine mentors for each identified student.</li> <li>3. -All curriculums will implement interactive notebooks to aide in student mastery of standards.</li> <li>4. -Classrooms will deliver standards-based instruction using a variety of resources in order to teach to the full rigor of the standards and ensure student mastery of standards taught.</li> <li>5. -PLC groups will implement learning walks as a professional development tool in order to increase student learning.</li> <li>6. -Teachers will develop/conduct Fall/Spring data chats with students. This will include MAP data, FSA data, EOC data, and classroom performance data.</li> <li>7. -Classrooms will incorporate technology into their instruction using a variety of tools and programs. (ie: Achieve 3,000, Math 180, Zearn, Smarty Ants, etc.)</li> <li>8.-Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs as a way to progress monitor the implementation of strategies.</li> </ol>



**Person Responsible** Joshua Balkom (balkojm@bay.k12.fl.us)

## #2

**Title** Social and Emotional Behavior

**Rationale** Research indicates that children who are mentally healthy tend to be happier, show greater motivation to learn, have a more positive attitude toward school, more eagerly participate in class activities, and demonstrate higher academic performance than less mentally healthy peers (Hyson 2004; Kostelnik et al. 2015).

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** Deane Bozeman School will implement BUCK expectations in order to decrease discipline referrals by 5 percent.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** Pam Rudd (ruddpl@bay.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy** Implementation of social skills groups, PBIS strategies, Strong Kids curriculum to support the social and emotional needs of our students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** We have a district initiative to focus on the whole child to include social/emotional needs due to the natural disaster that our community encountered last school year and as a result of the heightened awareness of school violence that has plagued our nation.

## Action Step

**Description**

1. Guidance and administration will train staff on BUCK Expectations.
2. Display Buck Expectations posters in all classrooms and high traffic areas.
3. All levels will utilize the Low Level Referral System in order to decrease the number of referrals.
4. Monthly (secondary) and quarterly (elementary) behavior incentives( snack rewards, field trips, movie/popcorn, special presentations).
5. Conduct weekly homerooms for all levels to implement "Wisdom Wednesdays."
6. Implement monthly data chats at each level (grade level teachers, mtss specialists, administration).

**Person Responsible** Ivan Beach (beachji@bay.k12.fl.us)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

To keep students informed of the school's mission and vision, posters are placed around the school hallways, in the individual classrooms and the school website. In addition, the school website includes additional information such as the school calendar and information about the different programs offered at the school. We also have a strong social media presence that all stakeholders are invited to monitor. Teachers create and send home newsletters to keep parents informed about activities and lessons in the classroom. Parent Portal is a real-time information system that keeps both parents and students informed of student attendance, grades and additional individual academic information. Teachers communicate with parents through notes home, phone calls, Class DoJo, and email to communicate any issues that may arise in the classroom. The school uses the school-wide automated system, LINK, that will call residences to inform parents of school wide information, or in cases of emergency. SAC (School Advisory Council) serves as a bridge for parents and community members to have a stake in the academic success of all students.

**PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

The school provides various outlets for students' emotional and social needs. Students have access to one on one counseling through school-based guidance counselors and 2 site-based therapists. The Student 2 Student and Junior Student 2 Student programs assist new students with transitioning smoothly into our school. Teachers integrate a Bully-Proofing curriculum to educate students and make them feel safe and secure. Across K-12 classrooms, students will participate in weekly Character Education focused lessons each day through the Strong Kids curriculum. The school implements Take Stock in Children, Blessings in a Backpack, Happy Hanger, and Soles for Souls providing economically disadvantaged students with basic necessities. The school district provides small group and individual counseling to students identified through their individual educational plans. There is an on-campus military counselor to support students whose parents are active duty or retired military.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

DBS has three Pre-kindergarten classes. One is a VPK class which services 20 students instructed by a CDA instructor. Another class is a blended class with 11 VPK students which includes 9 ESE students. We have also added a self-contained Pre-K VE classroom to serve students who may not be ready for the blended classroom setting. All three classes have paraprofessionals that assist the instructors/teachers throughout the school day. Our Pre-kindergarten classes provide quality instruction using the VPK standards to ensure a quality learning environment which provides a safe environment that promotes the physical, social emotional and cognitive development of young children.

CDA instructors assess the students 3 times a year using VPK Assessment which is provided by the district. Results are shared each assessment period with families. CDA instructors use the results of the assessments to differentiate to meet academic needs.

These students feed into our kindergarten classrooms. Kindergarten teachers work closely with all Pre-K teachers to ensure a smooth transition into kindergarten. In the spring, our school holds a 'kindergarten round up' to encourage parents to register children for kindergarten classes. Local daycare centers and /preschools are given information regarding upcoming registrations and events to allow for Pre-K students to participate.

To assist students entering high school, we schedule school visits to surrounding middle schools. At these visits, we discuss course offerings and provide a course selection card. Students that participate in

various clubs and organizations assist with the visit, to answer any questions the students may have about extracurricular opportunities for high school. Students are also provided a summer reading packet that to be completed upon entering high school.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

The Leadership Team will meet monthly with their respective grade level and subject areas to examine core instruction and to assist each other in meeting both student and teacher needs. By implementing collaborative data teams and establishing group norms, teams will analyze data collected from common assessments across curriculums, expected student outcomes should increase. Instruction will be data driven as it relates specifically to students' areas of weakness. The team will also work with the administrators, as data coaches, to build capacity in analyzing data systematically and use the collected data to drive instruction using BDS Data Driven Dialogue.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

Students are given a Career Cluster Interest Survey to determine what career choices they are interested in. Once this information is gathered, a Career Day is scheduled which features guest speakers from the majority of the careers identified by the survey. Parent surveys also provide feedback for points of interest to be represented as well. The College and Career Expo assists students in understanding the relationship between coursework and the workforce. Workplace site visits are also scheduled throughout the year to local employers including Tyndall Air Force Base, Naval Coastal System Station, law enforcement agencies, medical centers and local colleges. College and/or Career speakers from the community enter classrooms to educate students about college and career opportunities in our area. Speakers include: Haney, FSU, Troy University, UWF, Florida A&M, politicians, financial experts, law enforcement, engineers, and medical professionals.

## Part V: Budget

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains for lowest 25% in ELA and Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Social and Emotional Behavior	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00